(1)

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

02 1074 JAN 2 2003

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. _____

InThe
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT
AMERICA

October Term, 2003

In Re Dr. Eileen Vey

☆☆☆INTERGALACTIC RESCUE☆☆☆ MISSION

ONE UNIVERSAL LAW

LAW AND ORDER ESTABLISHED

"LET FREEDOM RING!"

Emergency Extraordinary Writ
Mandamus/Prohibition
CASE EXPEDITION REQUESTED

DR. EILEEN VEY, Th.D.
804 Cedar Avenue
Pittsburgh PA 15212
(412) 322-3131

☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

11 pp

QUESTION PRESENTED

I.

AGAIN, WILL EILEEN VEY'S ("VEY") CASE RESTORE LAW AND ORDER TO HER COUNTRY AND ESTABLISH ONE HARMONIC LAW SYSTEM TO THE UNIVERSE AND WILL HER PRIMA FACIE HABEAS CORPUS BE GRANTED FINALLY.

PARTIES INVOLVED

"We The People of the Universe," everyone.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUBJECT	PAGE
Parties Involved	i
Table of Contents	ii
Petition for Writ	1
Order Below	1
Jurisdiction	1
U.S. Constitutional & Law Provisions	2
Statement of 19-Year Case	2
REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT	2
CONCLUSION	3
APPENDIX	

☆☆

No. _____

In The
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT
AMERICA

October Term, 2003

In Re: Eileen Vey

EMERGENCY EXTRAORDINARY WRIT PETITION
Mandamus/Prohibition
Case Expedition Requested

☆☆

The petitioner, Eileen Vey ("Vey"), hereby demands the granting of this Emergency Extraordinary Writ in the name of Justice and or the Clear and Present Danger of the operation of her country, The United States of America, Vey's Writ presents.

OPINIONS BELOW

For nineteen years, the petitioner has crimally been denied her rights to the laws of her native-born country of the U.S.A., due to the illegal operation of the courts, which poses the dangers she mentions above.

JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction is envoked under The United States Constitution, Article III and Amendment 11, 28 USC §§ 1251 & 1651, ORIGINAL JURISDICTION (Rule 17), and the Extraordinary Writ (Rule 20).

U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL & FEDERAL PROVISIONS

This Court has a responsibility of **upholding The U.S. Constitution** under its Linchpin, ARTICLE VI (2), the Federal Supremacy Clause, **Marburger v. Madison, Ginsburg v. U.S.**, and **Chisholm v. Georgia, against conflicting acts and laws** in this anarchial, seditious and TREASONOUS TIME in America.

STATEMENT OF CASE

For nineteen years, Vey has been kidnapped by Pennsylvania in violation of the Civil Rights, RICO and the TREASON (sedition/anarchy) statutes. She is presently in illegal custody to the PA Parole Board.

REASONS FOR WRIT GRANTING

As has been noted, because Vey is prejudicially kidnapped due to cover-up of case and political jealousy for nineteen years after proving the physical evidence shows her innocence to every Branch of U.S.A. Government, the petitioner has justified the granting of the Writ, since it shows 10 it will be an aid of the Court's appellate jurisdiction, 2) that truly exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of the Court's discretionary powers, and 3) that adequate relief (two decades) cannot be obtained in any other form or from any other court.

That is, Vey is being denied her rightful U.S. Constitutional relief to state prima facie habeas corpus (time up April 2003) and to the clearing of her name of all charges or dropping of all charges against her (Mandamus) due to insufficient evidence. In brief, our U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL FORM OF GOVERNMENT has been overturned, a CLEAR and PRESENT DANGER, A MATTER OF National Security.

During a lifetime of two decades, the Petitioner proved, IF SHE COMMITTED ANY ACT, she proved INNOCENCE OF 3RD degree homocide and gun (Carrying firearm w/o a licence) charged by one judge (no jury), because she met legal premise requirements of laws that have not been repealed, 1) Insanity Defense's McNaughten Rule, 18 PA CSA § 301 & 501; 2) Self-Defense/Justification Defense, admitted by Superior Court Judges due to life-threatening situation, "reasonable doubt" of which bullet (silencer?), if any, caused alleged victim to go down before gun shot heard; 3) PA Constitution and "exception clause" of gun statute, 18 PA CSA § 6101 "(b)," (home was road, transient at time, people live in motor homes).

However, after further study of evidence, the Petitioner proved SHE COMMITTED NO ACT, because there was no evidence to link petitioner to alleged contaminated crime scene, ie, petitioner found by hotel, no blood, "reasonable doubt" of whose gun; no ballistic, no serial match, no gunpowder on petitioner's hands after a powder test, alleged victim went down (silencer" heart attack?) before gun shot heard, perjured statement of other nonexistent weapons cause more "reasonable doubt" of weapon, at strange time of day, gang of men and man, who disappeared from scene, were suspects themselves, list goes on...

In brief, the Petitioner is being DENIED DUE PROCESS of all the laws contained herein and, namely the PENNSYLVANIA HABEAS CORPUS relief, after proving evidence of innocence and "reasonable doubt" of guilt AND EVIDENCE OF PRIMA FACIE attached hereto - NO REFUTATION OF HABEAS CORPUS.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, the petitioner, Vey, prays this Court will grant this Mandamus (drop all charges) or alternative Prima Facie Habeas Corpus (if April 13, 2003 time has not terminated).

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Vey 12-25-02

Appendix 1

TO: Judge Novak
Mr. Mike Streilly, ADA

Dr. Eileen Vey, Th.D.
804 Cedar Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania U.S.A.
(412) 322-3131

As of 10-9-02 I have no response to this letter, for a one year state habeas corpus of 18 years, before Judge Novak.

Mailed 7-29-02

11 July 2002

Dear Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Officials:

Re: Com of PA v. Eileen Vey (1984)
CC 8406363 and CC 840555 AO
PA SUPREME COURT, No. 34 WD 2002

I am hereby declaring my FREEDOM, because legally and technically I AM FREE OF THE ABOVE CHARGES and just came upon the realization! Therefore, I request that all the appropriate paper work be initiated in the clearing of the charges from my name, et cetera.

Attached is the paperwork evidence to prove that I am innocent and free from alll charges, The Pennsylvania Supreme Court Judges' Order of no refutation evidence and the Allegheny County District Attorney's Letter of no refutation evidence.

I submitted the claim and evidence of the fact that I am innocent according to the laws of this country in a King's Bench Matter of a PA Prima Facie Habeas Corpus Petition. Both all the Judges of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court and the Allegheny County District Attorney did not refute my claim of INNOCENT OF ABOVE CHARGES, and therefore, I AM FREE, legally and technically.

PRIMA FACIE LAW
THE LAW

THE LAW concerning PRIMA FACIE: Courts use the concept of "prima facie" case in two senses: (1) in sense of plaintiff producing evidence sufficient to render reasonable a conclusion in favor of allegation she asserts; and (2) in sense that, not only the palintiff's evidence would reasonable allow conclusion plaintiff seeks, but also that plaintiff's evidence compels such a conclusion, if the defendants produce no evidence to rebut it. Husbands v. Com of PA, D.C. of PA, 395 FS 1107, 1130.

PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE is evidence good and sufficient on its face and such evidence which, in the judgment of the law, is sufficient to establish a given fact. Moreover, prima facie evidence is evidence which, if unexplained or uncontradicted, is sufficient to sustain a judgment in favor of the issue which it supports. State v. Haremza, 213 Kan. 201, 512 P.2d

I thank God especially and all those involved!

Sincerely,

Eileen Vey

President Bush

ATTACHMENTS: (2) PA SUPREME COURT ORDER & D.A.'s Letter
CC: Stephen A. Zappala, D.A. of Allegheny County
PA Parole Board (2)
Judge Novak
F. B. I. Director

PA GOVERNOR

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appendix 2

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CRIMINAL DIVISION

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA	:	
	:	
v.	:	CC NO. 198406363
	:	198406555
EILEEN VEY	:	

NOTICE TO PRO SE DEFENDANT

AND NOW, to wit, this 21st day of October 2002, pursuant to Pa.R.Crim.P. 1507, the parties are hereby notified that this Court intends to dismiss the defendant's Habeas Corpus Petition without a hearing for the following reasons:

(1) Although captioned "Habeas Corpus", the Petition, seeking collateral relief, rests on the P.C.R.A., and is subject to the limitations set forth by that act. *Commonwealth v. Chester*, 557 Pa. 358, 733 A.2d 1242 (1999); *Commonwealth v. Fahy*, 558 Pa. 313, 737 A.2d 214 (1999); and

(2) The Petition is time-barred; and

(3) The Superior Court has already ruled that no exceptions allowing for collateral relief apply herein; and

(4) The defendant appears to have abandoned her motion by declaring that she is no longer subject to the jurisdiction of this court.

The defendant may respond to this Notice within twenty days.

BY THE COURT:



Hon. Raymond Novak, J.

cc: Eileen Vey, Th.D.
Office of the District Attorney - Appeals Division

Appendix 3

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 00-4362

Vey v. Bigley

To: Clerk

1) Motion to Reopen This Mandamus/Prohibition or Alternative: Grant Relief

---

No action will be taken in regard to the foregoing Motion. The time for seeking rehearing of the Court's decision has expired. In addition the Court has determined that it lacks jurisdiction in the matter. The Motion presents no legal arguments as to why that determination was incorrect. It would appear that if the Court could not act in regard to the prior actions of the state court, it cannot act as to subsequent action.

For the Court,

Marcia M. Waldron

Clerk

Dated: December 3, 2002

CH/cc: Dr. Eileen Vey
Rebecca D. Spangler, Esq.